

REMARKS

By this paper, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 5, 6, and 9-13. Thus, Claims 1-7 and 9-14 remain pending and are presented for further examination.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶ 1

In paragraph 4 of the Office action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant submits that the claims are supported by the specification. However, in order to expedite the allowance of the claims, the Applicant has amended the claims. Claim 1, as amended, recites a limb protection device comprising a sleeve for use in enclosing the limb section, the sleeve being sealed at one end, and at least one flexible cuff integral with the sleeve and away from which the sleeve extends, the cuff being sealed at one end and having a tapered profile. The subject matter of the amended claims is disclosed at least at page 5, lines 19-24, and at page 6, lines 25-31. For example, an embodiment illustrated in Figure 1 and described on page 5, lines 19-24, is a limb protection device comprising a sleeve portion 12 and an integral cuff portion 14. Further, the specification teaches, in one embodiment, that the device may be manufactured in sterile conditions and both ends may be sealed (see specification at page 6, lines 25-27). Thus, the Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

The Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are made in order to improve the clarity of claim language, to correct grammatical mistakes or ambiguities, and to otherwise improve the clarity of the claims to particularly and distinctly point out the invention to those of skill in the art. Finally, the Applicant submits that the claim limitations above represent only illustrative distinctions. Hence, there may be other patentable features that distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art.

Appl. No. : 10/563,547
Filed : June 12, 2006

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and, particularly, that all claims be allowed. If the Examiner finds any remaining impediment to the prompt allowance of these claims that could be clarified with a telephone conference, the Examiner is respectfully invited to call the undersigned.

Although the present communication may include alterations to the application or claims, or characterizations of claim scope or referenced art, the Applicant is not conceding in this application that previously pending claims are not patentable over the cited references. Rather, any alterations or characterizations are being made to facilitate expeditious prosecution of this application. The Applicant reserves the right to pursue at a later date any previously pending or other broader or narrower claims that capture any subject matter supported by the present disclosure, including subject matter found to be specifically disclaimed herein or by any prior prosecution. Accordingly, reviewers of this or any parent, child or related prosecution history shall not reasonably infer that the Applicant has made any disclaimers or disavowals of any subject matter supported by the present application.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: April 15, 2008

By: 

Mark M. Abumeri
Registration No. 43,458
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20995
(619) 235-8550